

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 15

R E M A R K S

A. Summary of the Invention

Broadly, in one aspect, the subject invention concerns a method for determining the genotype at a genetic locus for a sample of genetic material obtained from a biological sample. The method includes a step of reacting the material at the locus to produce a first reaction value indicative of the presence of a given allele at the locus. A data set is formed which includes at least the first reaction value. The method of the invention also includes a step of establishing a distribution set of probability distributions associating hypothetical reaction values with corresponding probabilities for each genotype of interest at the locus. The method of the invention further includes a step of applying the first reaction value to each pertinent probability distribution to determine a measure of a conditional probability of each genotype of interest at the locus. Finally, the method of the invention includes a step of determining the genotype based on data from the step of applying the first reaction value to each pertinent probability distribution to determine a measure of the conditional probability of each genotype of interest at the locus.

B. Summary of the Outstanding Office Action

In the Office Action of 28 April 2003, claims 51 through 54 inclusive and 69 through 74 inclusive were rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) as unpatentable over a publication by Kimpton *et al.* in *PCR Methods and Applications*, volume 3, pages 13 through 22 (August 1993) ("the Kimpton *et al.* publication"). It was asserted that the Kimpton *et al.* publication disclosed at page 14 a method of determining the genotype at a locus within genetic material obtained by polymerase chain reaction ("PCR") amplification. With citations to pages 14 through 16 and Figures 1 and 2 of the Kimpton *et al.* publication, it was asserted that the method of the publication included (a) assembling reaction value data points for samples where each reaction value data point corresponded to a respective one of the samples and included at least one

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 16

reaction value. It was asserted that the datapoints were represented by each of the separate peaks shown in Figure 1 of the publication and represented a different sample and that the datapoints were assembled as shown in Figure 2. It was asserted further that the method of the Kimpton *et al.* publication included a step (b) of determining an initial conditional probability for each reaction value data point for each genotype. It was asserted that the data was initially analyzed by analyzing bands to establish a conditional probability for reaction value, with a citation to page 15 and Figure 1. It was asserted further in the outstanding Office Action that the method of the Kimpton *et al.* publication included a step (c) of computing a conditional probability of each genotype for each reaction value data point. It was asserted that a calculation of band sizing determined the allele to which the sample belonged, assertedly thereby determining a genotype since assertedly a genotype was composed of particular allele at particular positions. Page 16, columns 2 and 3 and page 17, Table 2 were cited in connection with this assertion. It was asserted further that the method of the Kimpton *et al.* publication included a step (d) of determining the genotype and confidence score for each reaction value data point, assertedly thereby determining the genotype and confidence score at the genetic locus for each sample. Table 2 on page 17 was asserted to provide for each reaction point the genotype and a standard deviation based on the data obtained from step (d).

It was asserted further in the Office Action of 28 April 2003 that the Kimpton *et al.* publication disclosed reacting material at multiple loci and disclosed multiple alleles in probability distributions. Figure 2 on page 16 was cited in connection with an assertion that the Kimpton *et al.* publication disclosed the use of multiple data points derived from multiple runs of an automated apparatus, assertedly including multiple data sets in the method and apparatus of the publication. It was asserted that the Kimpton *et al.* publication disclosed that the locus may be dinucleotide or tetranucleotide repeats and that the publication selected the loci for their discrimination ability and disclosed that several different loci may be analyzed.

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 17

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 51 through 54 inclusive and 60 through 74 inclusive were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of a publication by Clark in *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, volume 7, pages 111 through 122 (March 1990) ("The Clark publication"). It was admitted in the outstanding Office Action that the Kimpton *et al.* publication did not disclose modification of data to iteratively improve an assay. It was asserted that the Clark publication disclosed a method of resolving ambiguities by performing an iterative cascade of improvements on data points. It was asserted that the method of the Clark *et al.* publication was applied to restriction site polymorphisms. With a reference to a passage in the abstract of the Clark publication which asserted that the algorithm of the publication applied to the problem of inferring haplotype frequencies of closely linked restriction site polymorphisms, it was asserted that an ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to apply the conceptual idea of iterative data processing of the Clark publication in the genotyping method of the Kimpton *et al.* publication in order to extract as close to the entirety of the allelic sequences as possible. It was asserted further that an ordinary practitioner would have recognized that the method could be performed using any length marker, including single nucleotide polymorphisms such as the restriction site polymorphisms assertedly disclosed in the Clark publication.

Claims 51 through 54 inclusive and 56 through 74 inclusive were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) in the Office Action of 18 January 2002 as unpatentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of Clark publication and further in view of published International Patent Application WO 92/15712 to Goelet *et al.* ("the Goelet *et al.* '712 published international application"). It was admitted in the outstanding Office Action that the Kimpton *et al.* publication even in view of the Clark publication did not teach genetic bit analysis, which was asserted to include allele specific amplification. It was asserted that it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of the hypothetical combination of the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Clark publication with the use of genetic bit analysis or allele specific amplification to develop the data

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 18

in view of the Goelet *et al.* '712 international published application. It was asserted that an ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to substitute an assertedly equivalent genetic bit analysis method for PCR assertedly in order to minimize the need for gel electrophoresis and enhance the automatability of the process as assertedly motivated by the Goelet *et al.* international published application assertedly in order to speed analysis and minimize cost.

Claims 51 through 54 inclusive, 56, 58, and 60 through 74 inclusive were rejected in the outstanding Office Action under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable under the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Clark publication and further in view of United States patent No. 5,516,663 to Backman *et al.* ("the Backman *et al.* '663 patent"). It was admitted in the Office Action that the Kimpton *et al.* publication even in view of the Clark *et al.* publication did not disclose the use of a ligation chain reaction. It was asserted that the Backman *et al.* '663 patent disclosed a method of ligation chain reaction. It was asserted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of the hypothetical combination of the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Clark publication with the use of a ligation chain reaction as assertedly disclosed in the Backman *et al.* '663 patent. A passage at column 2, lines 8 through 10 of the Backman *et al.* '663 patent was cited in this connection. It was asserted that an ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to substitute the ligation chain reaction for an assertedly equivalent amplification method of polymerase chain reaction with the asserted motivation that the ligation chain reaction assertedly could detect small numbers of target molecules and assertedly because ligation chain reaction was a known equivalent amplification assay to the polymerase chain reaction disclosed in the Kimpton *et al.* publication.

In the Office Action of 28 April 2003, claims 75 through 83 inclusive, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91 through 93 inclusive, and 95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of a publication by Ledwina *et al.* in *Biometrics*, volume 36, pages 160 through 165 (1980) ("the Ledwina *et al.* publication") and further as motivated in view

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 19

of a publication by Jeanpierre in the *Annals of Human Genetics*, volume 56, page 325 through 330 (1992). ("the Jeanpierre publication") It was asserted that the Kimpton *et al.* publication disclosed at page 14 a method of determining the genotype at a locus within genetic material obtained by PCR amplification. With citations to page 14, columns 1 through 3 of the Kimpton *et al.* publication, it was asserted that a method of the publication included reacting material at the locus to produce a first reaction value. It was asserted further, with a citation to pages 14 through 16 of the Kimpton *et al.* publication, that the publication disclosed forming a data set including the first reaction value by assembling reaction value data points for the sample with each reaction value data point assertedly corresponding to a respective one of the samples and including at least one reaction value. It was asserted that the data points represented by each of the separate peaks in Figure 1 represented a different sample and were assembled in Figure 2. With a reference to pages 16 and 17 of the Kimpton *et al.* publication, it was asserted that the Kimpton *et al.* publication disclosed determining the genotype and a confidence score for each reaction value data point to assertedly determine the genotype and confidence score at the genetic locus for each sample. It was asserted that Table 2 on page 17 of the publication provided for each reaction point the genotype and a standard deviation based on the data obtained from a step D. With regard to claims 77 and 78, it was asserted that the Kimpton *et al.* publication disclosed reacting the material have multiple glossy at page 14, Table 1. With regard to claims 80 through 82, it was asserted that the Kimpton *et al.* publication on page 17 considered multiple alleles in the probability distributions. Table 2 was cited with the assertion that the Table disclosed that the method was applicable to any number of alleles. It was asserted that Kimpton expressly disclosed the use of multiple data points derived from multiple runs of an automated apparatus including multiple data sets in the method and apparatus disclosed at page 16 and in Figure 2.

Significantly, it was admitted in the outstanding Office Action that, although the Kimpton *et al.* publication disclosed the use of a Hardy-Weinberg test, the publication did not disclose establishing a distribution set of probability distributions and did not disclose applying the

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 20

reaction value of the distributions to determine a measure of the conditional probability of each genotype of interest at the locus.

It was asserted in the Office Action of 28 April 2003 that the Ledwina *et al.* publication disclosed a method in which genotypes could be determined in which the Hardy-Weinberg test was modified assertedly to include the steps of establishing a distribution set of probability distributions and associating hypothetical values with corresponding probabilities for each genotype of interest. Pages 162 and 163 of the Ledwina *et al.* publication were cited in this regard. It was asserted further that the Ledwina *et al.* publication disclosed the step of applying the first value to each pertinent probability distribution to determine a measure of conditional probabilities of each genotype of interest, citing in particular pages 162 and 163 of the Ledwina *et al.* publication. It was asserted further in the Office Action that, with respect to claims 76 and 79, the Ledwina *et al.* publication, in referring on page 162 to “common probability distribution of (T,Z) is multiple nominal with $1\frac{1}{2} m(m+1)$ cells and with the vector of cell probabilities $g=(g...)$,” assertedly disclosed a plurality of distributions which were hypothetical. It was asserted that the Jeanpierre publication motivated the use of computation of unknown genotypes to analyze conditional probabilities relative to a distribution of hypothetical reaction values. Page 330 of the Jeanpierre publication was cited in this connection.

It was asserted in the outstanding Office Action that it would have been prima-facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify the method of the Kimpton *et al.* publication to use a conditional probability distribution method assertedly disclosed in the Ledwina *et al.* publication, since the Kimpton *et al.* publication assertedly noted that the analysis of the publication used Hardy-Weinberg equilibria and since the Ledwina *et al.* publication disclosed a class of admissible tests for the Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium in a multiple allelic system. It was asserted that an ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to apply the asserted hypothetical distribution analysis to genotyping since the Jeanpierre publication assertedly disclosed certain gains from creating such a distribution, including

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 21

avoiding a hazard of incorrectly using a simple average of conditional probabilities instead of a harmonic means.

In the Office Action of 28 April 2003, claims 75 through 86 inclusive, 88, 89, 91 through 93 inclusive, and 95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Ledwina *et al.* publication and further as motivated in view of the Jeanpierre publication. It was asserted that the hypothetical combination of the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Ledwina *et al.* publication as motivated in view of the Jeanpierre publication disclosed the limitations of claims 75 through 83 inclusive, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91 through 93 inclusive, and 95. It was admitted in the Office Action that the hypothetical combination of the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Ledwina *et al.* publication as motivated by Jeanpierre did not disclose iteration of the method. It was asserted that the Clark publication disclosed a method of resolving ambiguous by performing an iterative cascade of improvements on data points. It was asserted that it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the iterative screening and improvement methods of the Clark publication with the probability of Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Ledwina *et al.* publication as motivated in view of the Jeanpierre publication in view of a statement in the Clark publication concerning an algorithm for extracting allelic sequences applied to the problem of inferring haplotype frequencies of closely linked restriction site polymorphisms. It was asserted that an ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to apply the idea of iterative data processing of the Clark publication in the genotyping method of the hypothetical combination of the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Ledwina *et al.* publication as motivated by the Jeanpierre publication in order to extract as close to the entirety of the allelic sequences as possible.

Claims 75 through 83 inclusive and 85 through 95 inclusive were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in the outstanding Office Action over the hypothetical combination of the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Ledwina *et al.* publication and further as motivated in

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 22

view of the Jeanpierre publication. It was admitted that the hypothetical combination of the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Ledwina *et al.* publication as motivated by the Jeanpierre publication did not teach genetic bit analysis which assertedly included allele specific amplification, nor the particular alleles listed. It was noted that the Goelet *et al.* '712 published international application disclosed genetic bit analysis methods. It was asserted in the Office Action that it would have been *prima facie* obvious to combine the method of the hypothetical combination of the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Clark publication with the use of the genetic bit analysis or allele specific amplification to develop the data, in view of a statement in the Goelet *et al.* published application on page 8, lines 27 through 33. It was asserted that an ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to substitute the genetic bit analysis method for PCR amplification in order to minimize the need for gel electrophoresis and enhance the automatability of the process to speed analysis and minimize costs as assertedly motivated by the Goelet *et al.* '712 published international application.

C. Summary of the Present Amendments
And Request for Reconsideration

New claims 96 through 105 inclusive have been added to the present response. The new claims find support in the application as originally filed, for example, at page 2, line 11 through page 3, line 20 and page 12, line 5 through page 16, line 12. It is submitted that new claims 96 through 105 inclusive do not constitute new matter.

Reconsideration of the subject application as amended above in light of the comments below is respectfully requested.

D. The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

At the outset, we note that it was admitted in the next-to-last paragraph on page 8 of the outstanding Office Action that the Kimpton *et al.* publication, the principal citation relied on in the Office Action, did not disclose establishing a distribution set of probability distributions. The

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 23

Kimpton *et al.* publication did not therefore disclose determining a measure of a conditional probability of each genotype of interest at a locus by applying reaction values to the distribution, as seemingly also admitted in the next-to-last paragraph on page 8 of the Office Action. The attorneys for the applicants fully agree with the analysis of the Kimpton *et al.* publication in the paragraph under discussion on page 8 of the Office Action to the effect that the Kimpton *et al.* publication does not disclose the establishment of a distribution set of probability distributions and submit that in failing to disclose (or even suggest) a distribution set of probability distributions, the Kimpton *et al.* publication fails as an anticipatory reference against the claims of the subject application as amended.

The Kimpton *et al.* publication disclosed automated DNA profiling, based on detection of amplified tri-, tetra-, and pentanucleotide short-tandem-repeat (“STR”) loci by electrophoresis on denaturing polyacrylamide sequencing gels using automated fluorescence-based technology. According to the abstract of the Kimpton *et al.* publication, the system of the publication used an internal size standard in each sample to permit the short tandem repeat products amplified by PCR to be sized automatically. Three multiplex short-tandem-repeat systems containing a total of fourteen different loci were used, with different fluorescent markers used for loci which had overlapping allele size ranges.

Concerning the technique for automatically sizing the short tandem repeat products in the procedure of the Kimpton *et al.* publication, the publication disclosed at page 16, column 1, lines 9 through 18 that amplification products of the short-tandem-repeat loci were tagged by the attachment of a fluorescent dye molecule to one of each pair of the loci-specific amplification primers. Amplification products from each of the three multiplex amplification-reaction systems were respectively electrophoresed for eight hours on a polyacrylamide denaturing sequencing gel in an automated DNA sequencer. During electrophoresis on the denaturing polyacrylamide gels, amplified products were detected by laser scanning. According to column 1, lines 17 through 34 of page 15 of the publication, fragment sizes after eight hours of electrophoresis on the

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 24

automated DNA sequencer were determined using software employing a method of second order regression to establish a curve of best fit for the internal standard in each lane. Other than the reference to second order regression, internal operation of the software for determining fragment sizes does not appear to be described in the Kimpton *et al.* publication. As noted above, the attorneys for the applicants agree with the assessment in the next-to-last paragraph on page 8 of the Office Action of 28 April 2003 that the Kimpton *et al.* publication does not disclose establishing a distribution set of probability distributions and applying a reaction value of the distributions to determine a measure of a conditional probability of each genotype of interest at the genetic locus under investigation.

In contrast, new independent claim 96 of the subject application as amended is directed to a method of associating with a sample of genetic material one of a predetermined plurality of genotypic-class identifiers defined with respect to a genetic locus sited in the genetic material together with a corresponding confidence measure, which includes a step of obtaining with respect to each of the genotypic-class identifiers corresponding reaction-value data-point conditional-probability-measure distribution information, which provides, over a set of hypothetical reaction-value data points, a conditional probability measure as a function of the reaction values of each hypothetical reaction-value data point given the genetic-class identifier. The method of new claim 96 includes the further step of evaluating for each of the genotypic-class identifiers the corresponding reaction-value data-point conditional-probability-measure distribution information with respect allele-indicative reaction values of the reaction-value data point corresponding to the sample, to obtain for each of the corresponding genotypic-class identifiers a reaction-value data-point conditional probability measure of the reaction-value data point, given the genotypic-class identifier.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the automated DNA profiling method of the Kimpton *et al.* publication would have neither disclosed nor in any way suggested the method of associating one of a predetermined plurality of genotypic-class identifiers of new

claim 96. It is submitted therefore that new claim 96 is patentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication. New claims 97 through 105 inclusive are dependent claims, which depend upon new claim 96 directly or indirectly, and consequently incorporate the limitations of new claim 96 by reference. For reasons discussed above in connection with new claim 96, it is submitted that the Kimpton *et al.* publication would have neither disclosed nor in any way suggested the subject matter of new claims 97 through 105 inclusive. It is submitted therefore that each new claims 97 through 105 inclusive is patentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication and that the rejection of any of new claims 97 through 105 inclusive under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as unpatentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication would be without justification.

Claim 72 of the subject application is directed to a method of determining both genotype and confidence scores at a genetic locus for a plurality of samples of genetic material, where the samples have been prepared under comparable conditions. The method includes the step of assembling reaction-value data points for the samples. Each reaction-value data point is specified to correspond to a respective one of the samples and to include at least one reaction value. The method of claim 72 further includes the step of determining an initial conditional probability for each reaction-value data point for each genotype and computing a conditional probability of each genotype for each reaction-value data point. The method of claim 72 finally includes the step of determining the genotype and confidence score for each reaction-value data point, thus determining the genotype and confidence score at the genetic locus for each sample.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the automated DNA profiling method of the Kimpton *et al.* publication would have neither disclosed nor in any way suggested the method of determining the genotype and confidence scores at a genetic locus of claim 72 of the subject application. It is submitted therefore that claim 72 is patentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication.

Claims 51 through 54 inclusive, 73, and 74 are dependent claims which depend upon claim 72 directly or indirectly, and consequently incorporate the limitations of claim 72 by

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 26

reference. For the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 72, it is submitted that the Kimpton *et al.* publication would have neither disclosed nor in any way suggested the subject matter of claims 51 through 54 inclusive, as amended, 73, and 74. It is submitted therefore that each of claims 51 through 54 inclusive, as amended, 73, and 74 is patentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication and that the rejection of claims 51 through 54 inclusive, as amended, 73, and 74 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as unpatentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication is without justification and should be withdrawn.

Claim 69 of the subject application is an independent claim directed to a method of determining for a plurality of samples analyzed with comparable biochemistry, a genotype and a confidence score for the genotype at a locus within genetic material. The method of claim 69 includes the step of measuring, under comparable conditions, a first reaction value for each sample which is indicative of the presence of a given allele at the locus. The method of claim 69 further includes the step of forming a data set from the reaction values and establishing initial probability distributions for the genotype of interest at the locus. The method of claim 69 further includes the step of calculating the conditional probability of each genotype of interest at the locus, by applying the first reaction value to each probability distribution in the set of probability distributions that corresponds to the first reaction value. Finally, claim 69 includes the step of determining the genotype and confidence score.

It is submitted that the method for automated DNA profiling employing multiplex amplification of short-tandem-repeat loci coupled with direct detection of amplified products on polyacronamid gels of the Kimpton *et al.* publication would have neither anticipated nor in any way rendered obvious the subject matter of claim 69 of the subject application. It is submitted that the rejection of claim 69 under U.S.C. § 102(b) as unpatentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication was unwarranted and should be withdrawn.

Claims 70 and 71 are dependent claims which depend upon claim 69 directly or indirectly, and consequently incorporate the limitations of claim 69 by reference. For the reasons

noted above, it is submitted that the method of the Kimpton *et al.* publication neither anticipates nor in any way renders obvious the methods of dependent claims 70 and 71 of the subject application. It is submitted that the methods of claims 70 and 71 of the subject application are patentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication, and that the rejection of claims 70 and 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) was without justification and should be withdrawn.

E. The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

E.1 The Kimpton *et al.* Publication in View of the Clark Publication

The Clark publication disclosed a method for resolving ambiguities in sequencing on sequencing gels alleles from PCR-amplified DNA samples from diploid individuals. The method of the Clark publication involved obtaining DNA samples from a population of diploid individuals and identifying a homozygote or a single heterozygous site on the sequencing gel. According to lines 2 through 6 on page 112 of the Clark publication, a homozygote could be recognized on the sequencing gel by a lack of ambiguous sites. Once a homozygote was found, a haplotype had been identified. Two haplotypes were identified if the individual had a single heterozygous site. The method of the Clark publication involved tallying the haplotypes identified by finding homozygotes and single heterozygous sites. As disclosed at line 7 through 12 on page 112 of the Clark publication, the method of resolving ambiguous sequences entailed determining, for each known haplotype, whether the haplotype could be made from some combination of the ambiguous sites. For each such haplotype, the complement of the haplotype was recovered as another potential haplotype. The process was continued until all haplotypes have been recovered or no new haplotype can be found.

It is submitted that the Clark publication in no way cures the infirmities of the Kimpton *et al.* publication as a reference against claims 51 through 54 inclusive and 69 through 74 inclusive of the subject application as amended. It is submitted therefore that the Kimpton *et al.* publication considered alone or in combination with the Clark publication would have neither

disclosed nor suggested the method of claims 51 through 54 inclusive and 60 through 74 inclusive of the subject application as amended. Consequently, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 51 through 54 inclusive and 60 through 74 inclusive of the subject application under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Clark publication was without justification and should be withdrawn.

E.2 The Kimpton *et al.* Publication in View of the Clark Publication
Further in View of the Goelet *et al.* '712 Published International Application

As disclosed in the abstract, the Goelet *et al.* '712 published international application disclosed a method for determining the identity of a nucleotide base at a specific position in a nucleic acid of interest and a method for determining the presence or absence of a particular nucleotide sequence in a sample of nucleic acids. The methods entailed contacting nucleic acid of interest with an oligonucleotide primer under hybridizing conditions and treating the resulting duplex, if any, with a terminator reagent under conditions permitting base pairing of a complementary terminator present in the reagent and the occurrence of a template-dependent, primer extension reaction so as to incorporate the terminator at the 3' end of the primer. The identity of the terminator at the 3' end of the primer determined whether the hybridization occurred and the identity of the base complementary to the terminator.

The Kimpton *et al.* publication disclosed an automated DNA profiling method which employed three multiplex groups of particular three to five-base pair short-tandem-repeat loci which were amplified groupwise by PCR and analyzed by denaturing polyacrylamide sequencing gels.

Neither the Clark publication nor the Goelet *et al.* '712 published international application cures the infirmities of the Kimpton *et al.* publication as a reference against claims 51 through 54 inclusive and 56 through 74 inclusive of the subject application as amended. Moreover, it is submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art as of the effective filing date of the subject application would not have attempted to combine the methods of the Kimpton *et al.*

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 29

publication and the Clark publication with a method of the Goelet *et al.* '712 published international application as hypothetically proposed in the outstanding Office Action, particularly since the Kimpton *et al.* publication disclosed that the method of the publication was satisfactory for its intended purpose.

It is submitted therefore that the Kimpton *et al.* publication considered alone or in view of the Clark publication or further in view of the Goelet *et al.* '712 published international application would have neither disclosed nor suggested the method of any of claims 51 through 54 inclusive and 56 through 74 inclusive of the subject application as amended and that the rejection of such claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Clark publication and further in view of the Goelet *et al.* '712 published international application should be withdrawn.

E.3 The Kimpton *et al.* Publication in View of the Clark Publication
 Further in View of the Backman *et al.* '663 Patent

The Backman *et al.* '663 patent disclosed a ligase chain reaction with a certain endonuclease correction and contamination control. The Backman *et al.* '663 patent does not appear to cure the infirmities of the Kimpton *et al.* publication and the Clark publication -- separately or in hypothetical combination as proposed in the outstanding Office Action -- as references against claims 51 through 54 inclusive, 56, 58, and 60 through 74 inclusive of the subject application as amended. It is submitted that the Kimpton *et al.* publication, the Clark publication, and the Backman *et al.* '663 patent considered alone or in any combination do not disclose or in any way suggest the method of claims 51 through 54 inclusive, 56, 58, and 60 through 74 inclusive and that the rejection of claims 51 through 54 inclusive, 56, 58, and 60 through 74 inclusive as amended under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Clark publication and further in view of the Backman *et al.* '663 patent was not justified and should be withdrawn.

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 30

E.4 The Kimpton *et al.* Publication in View of the Ledwina *et al.*
Publication as Motivated in View of the Jeanpierre Publication

As observed above, in the next-to-last paragraph on page 8 of the Office Action of 28 April 2003, it is admitted that the Kimpton *et al.* publication does not disclose establishing a distribution set of probability distributions and applying a reaction value of the distributions to determine a measure of a conditional probability of each genotype of interest at the genetic locus under investigation.

In contrast, claim 75 of the subject application is directed to a method for determining the genotype at a genetic locus for a sample of genetic material obtained from a biological sample which includes a step, among others, of establishing a distribution set of probability distributions associating hypothetical reaction values with corresponding probabilities for each genotype of interest at the locus. The method of claim 75 further includes a step of applying a first reaction value indicative of the presence of a given allele at the locus to each pertinent probability distribution to determine a measure of a conditional probability of each genotype of interest at the locus. The method of claim 75 also includes a step of determining the genotype based on data from the step of applying the first reaction value to each pertinent probability distribution.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the automated DNA profiling method of the Kimpton *et al.* publication would have neither disclosed nor in any way suggested the method of determining the genotype and confidence scores at a genetic locus of claim 75 of the subject application. It is submitted therefore that claim 75 is patentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication.

Claims 76 through 83 inclusive, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91 through 93 inclusive, and 95 are dependent claims, which depend upon claim 75 directly or indirectly, and consequently incorporate the limitations of claim 75 by reference. For the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 75, it is submitted that the Kimpton *et al.* publication would have neither disclosed nor in any way suggested the subject matter of claims 76 through 83 inclusive, 85, 86,

88, 89, 91 through 93 inclusive, and 95. It is submitted therefore that each of claims 76 through 83 inclusive, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91 through 93 inclusive, and 95 is patentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication and that the rejection of any of claims 76 through 95 inclusive under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as unpatentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication would be without justification.

The Ledwina *et al.* publication disclosed a statistical method for analyzing the allelic assignments for a population of multiallelic diploid individuals to determine whether the population exhibits so-called Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium. The statistical method for determining whether a population exhibits Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium takes as input data the allelic assignments for the population. The method of the Ledwina *et al.* publication involves processing previously determined allelic assignments from the individuals of a population. In contrast, the method of the Kimpton *et al.* publication involves determining certain allelic assignments for an individual based on analyzing a sample of DNA taken from the individual. It is submitted that the Ledwina *et al.* publication in no way cures the infirmities of the Kimpton *et al.* publication as a reference against claims 75 through 83 inclusive, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91 through 93 inclusive, and 95 of the subject application as amended.

The Jeanpierre publication disclosed a method for deriving the probability for a genotype of an “unsampled” person based on genotype assignments of family members in the pedigree of the unsampled person. The Kimpton *et al.* publication disclosed a method for determining certain allelic assignments for an individual based on detecting certain short tandem repeats in a sample of DNA taken from the individual.

Each of the Kimpton *et al.* publication, the Ledwina *et al.* publication, and the Jeanpierre publication is concerned with a different and disparate sort of genetic analysis: determination of a DNA profile of an individual from a sample of the individual’s DNA in the case of the Kimpton *et al.* publication, whether a population of multiallelic diploid individuals whose allelic assignments have previously been determined exhibits a Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium state in the case of the Ledwina *et al.* publication, and evaluation of the probability of the genotype of an

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 32

individual whose genetic material is not available for testing from the genotype of family members in the pedigree of the individual in the case of the Jeanpierre publication. It is submitted that in view of the fundamentally different sorts of genetic analysis disclosed in the Kimpton *et al.* publication, the Ledwina *et al.* publication, and the Jeanpierre publication, it would never have occurred to a person of ordinary skill in the art as of the effective filing date of the subject application to combine these three publications as proposed in the outstanding Office Action, and that, had such a hypothetical combination occurred to such a person, the combination would not have suggested the subject matter of claims 75 through 83 inclusive, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91 through 93 inclusive, and 95 of the subject application as amended.

It is submitted therefore that the Kimpton *et al.* publication considered alone or in any combination with the Ledwina *et al.* publication or the Jeanpierre publication would not have disclosed or suggested the method of any claims 75 through 83 inclusive, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91 through 93 inclusive, and 95 of the subject application as amended to a person of ordinary skill in the art, as of the effective filing date of the application. The rejection of claims 75 through 83 inclusive, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91 through 93 inclusive, and 95 in the outstanding Office Action as unpatentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication in view of the Ledwina *et al.* publication in view of the Jeanpierre publication, it is submitted therefore, was without justification and should be withdrawn.

E.5 The Kimpton *et al.* Publication in View of the Ledwina *et al.*
Publication as Motivated in View of the Jeanpierre
Publication and Further in View of the Clark Publication

The Clark publication, as noted above, disclosed a method for resolving ambiguities in sequencing on sequencing gels alleles from PCR-amplified DNA samples from diploid individuals. The Clark publication in no way connects the disparate methodologies of the Kimpton *et al.* publication, the Ledwina *et al.* publication, and the Jeanpierre publication. For the reasons discussed in the preceding subsection, it is submitted that it never would have occurred to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the disparate methods of the Kimpton

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 33

et al. publication and the Ledwina *et al.* publication, with or without the motivation of the Jeanpierre publication, in any combination with each other or with the Clark publication as of the effective filing date of the subject application, and that had such a hypothetical combination occurred to such a person, the combination would not have suggested the method of claims 75 through 86 inclusive, 88, 89, 91 through 93 inclusive, and 95 of the subject application as amended. It is submitted that the rejection of claims 75 through 86 inclusive, 88, 89, 91 through 93 inclusive, and 95 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is unpatentable over the Kimpton *et al.* publication, in view of the Ledwina *et al.* publication, as motivated in view of the Jeanpierre publication, and further in view of the Clark publication was without justification and should be withdrawn.

E.6 The Kimpton *et al.* Publication in View of the Ledwina *et al.* Publication as Motivated in View of the Jeanpierre Publication and Further in View of the Goelet *et al.* '712 Published International Application

The Goelet *et al.* '712 published international application disclosed a method for determining the identity of a nucleotide base at a specific position in a nucleic acid of interest and a method for determining the presence or absence of a particular nucleotide sequence in a sample of nucleic acids. The Goelet *et al.* published application does not connect the disparate methodologies of the Kimpton *et al.* publication, the Ledwina *et al.* publication, and the Jeanpierre publication. For the reasons discussed in the preceding subsection, it is submitted that it never would have occurred to a person of ordinary skill in the art, as of the effective filing date of the subject application, to combine the disparate methods of the Kimpton *et al.* publication and the Ledwina *et al.* publication, with or without the motivation of the Jeanpierre publication, in any combination with each other or with the Goelet *et al.* published application, and that had such a hypothetical combination occurred to such a person, the combination would not have suggested the method of claims 75 through 83 inclusive and 85 through 95 inclusive of the subject application as amended. It is submitted that the rejection of claims 75 through 83 inclusive and 85 through 95 inclusive under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is unpatentable over the

Applicants: Stephen E. Lincoln and
Michael R. Knapp
Serial No.: 09/618,178
Filed: 18 July 2000
Page 34

Kimpton *et al.* publication, in view of the Ledwina *et al.* publication, as motivated in view of the Jeanpierre publication, and further in view of the Goelet *et al.* '712 published international application was unwarranted and should be withdrawn.


F. Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the claims of the subject application as amended are patentable over the art of record considered alone or in any combination. Early allowance of the application is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorneys for the Applicants

by:


J. David Ellett, Jr.
(Reg. No. 27,875)

Telephone No. (212) 813-1600